A Response to Rainer Shea

> "Marxist Anti Imperialist Collective, a crypto Strasserite group, has advocated for Socialism with Richard Spencer Characteristics by endorsing the idea of a white state."

The above is written by a fellow named Rainer Shea. While we are not in the habit of responding to every critique leveled upon us, it is our understanding that Shea is rather well established among the online Anglo left, and he puts out articles fairly regularly. In fact, I had thought of critiquing articles of his a while back, but refrained for want of seeing his ideology mature on its own: evidently, this has not taken place. He compares our ideology to that of Otto Strasser, a National Socialist whose main economic principle was de-industrialization and the return to the medieval guild system, and Richard Spencer, a notorious deep state agent and Duke University graduate whose sole function is to spread homosexuality and Zionism among nationalists (or, according to the Southern Poverty Law Center, to spread nationalism among homosexuals and Zionists, as they argue in their 2016 article *Some White Nationalists Continue to Court the LGBT Community*), so as to drive a wedge between the revolutionary proletariat and revolutionary elements of the intelligentsia.

We cannot deny Shea has some influence among the online left, and so if he is truly sincere in finding the truth and advancing his principles as a communist, we figure that we might as well attempt to demonstrate the validity of our line against his attacks. Perhaps this will prove to be the impetuous by which Shea's own ideology is to finally mature.

> "Big surprise, why should we care so much?" writes Shea. "Well, this group is using certain tactics to spread its ideas widely. MAC runs several communist subreddits that are easy to mistake for being trustworthy, namely European Socialists, Americas Socialists, and Africas Socialists. They lure normies in, then use their favored members who've been trained in their rhetoric to push their ideas. What are these ideas? They're cloaked in communist language, but they consistently serve to nudge people towards the position of supporting white nationalism."

Shea is only half correct. MAC supports *all* nationalism; i.e. we are *inter-nationalists.* We agree with Zhdanov when he said that "inter-nationalism does not spring from the depletion and impoverishment of national culture, but from where national culture flourishes" – and we agree when he adds that "to forget this is to become a cosmopolitan without a country."

A nation, if valid under the Marxist formula, has the right to exist without assimilation; nationalism is nothing more than the principle of

national self-determination, the right to exist without being assimilated or enslaved. This is why MAC supports the nationalist causes of the "White" (Anglo-Saxon) as well as Black, French, German, Russian, etc. nations on principle. This is why MAC was supporting Anglo-Saxon nationalism even before it counted any Anglos among its ranks. This is why MAC supports the nationalism of all peoples on the American continent, including those indigenous nations which are still in existence, contrary to Shea's uninformed claim that "indigenous erasure is ironically part of MAC's' agenda as well, despite them claiming to care so much about national self-determination." Has he not read the way we speak of La Malinche, the very symbol of national betrayal? She was a traitor to whom, if not the nation of Nahua? Our principles demand the Nahuatl be given the right to exist without assimilation; Shea's principles demand no such right.

> "This idea that no nations can even voluntarily share in a singular state alliance, no matter how much autonomy the nations in this alliance have, is used by them to vilify the USSR and the PRC. They claim the DPRK is the only real current socialist country for this reason."

Shea again makes a misinformed (or deliberately misleading) claim that MAC "vilifies the USSR and the PRC". On the contrary, MAC extols the USSR's and PRC's virtues. When asked

the pinnacle of socialist leadership, we point to Stalin and his government, made up of men like Molotov and the aforementioned Zhdanov. But we make criticism of disastrous national policy *wherever it may arise,* including the USSR and PRC, the latter of which is particularly flawed in this regard. We do not claim the DPRK is "the only real current socialist country," but rather, *that it is the most advanced of the socialist countries to exist today* (and perhaps the most advanced to have ever existed at all). Furthermore, we openly acknowledge that the People's Republic of China, Cuba, Vietnam, are all socialist by fact, even if trending away from socialism economically and culturally; Belarus and Russia, which are neither socialist, nor do they obey the Marxist conceptions of the national question, nonetheless trend *towards* socialism every day! We acknowledge these things without hesitation, and in fact, are regularly attacked for these positions. It seems Shea assumes we are as dogmatic on the topic of nations as he is, and in doing so, becomes dreadfully confused about our actual positions. One reminds Stalin's characterizations of the anarchists, who "don't fight us, but figments of their own imagination, like Don Quixote jousting the windmill in times of old."

> "If this all-encompassing view of what 'chauvinism' means sounds like it's pro-balkanization, that's because this is exactly what they promote as an absolute for the conditions of any region. Even I no

> longer want to balkanize America, and instead desire a post-colonial federation."

We do not call for "Balkanization", which is the splitting of *real* nations (i.e. nations which actual language, historical constitution, etc.) into several states. On the contrary, we support the uniting of real nations into national states, and the splitting up of fake nations into national states. Balkanization entailed splitting Serbia and Albania into Serbia, Albania, and "Kosovo"; our line calls for the destruction of Kosovo and its partition back into Serbia and Albania based on majority populations. Thus, our line is the opposite of Balkanization. Balkanization would be the intentional splitting of the Anglo-Saxon nation into "America", "Britain", "Australia", "New Zealand", and so on. Does Shea know what "Balkanization" is?

On the other hand, Shea calls for a "post-colonial federation" – his name for an assimilationist state where the White and Black remain locked together, so that in a few generations, the Black fully assimilates into the vastly more numerous Whites (although one can be sure these fellows will continue to call themselves Black, just as Liz Warren insists she is a Cherokee). This radical solution is, in fact, the current program of the American State, and has been for 160 years. There is nothing really revolutionary about it, although Shea probably believes the Klan is the real power behind the throne in America, and thus assimilationism ("or

post-colonial federalism", or whatever fancy term he uses for Prince Hall Freemasonry) is actually an act of revolutionary progressivism.

> "This obsession with promoting balkanization naturally feeds into an imperialism-compatible view of Yugoslavia and the Balkan region's current hostilities, which I've also seen promoted by ultras."

Unfortunately, Shea does not even elaborate on what this position he has been hearing from ultras actually is, nor how it constitutes an "imperialism-compatible view" of Yugoslavia and the Balkan region. What is quoted above is all he says on the subject. Thus, we sadly cannot really address it. Perhaps Shea meant to go back and add more here.

> "But these people are worse than ultras. Racism is at their ideology's core. When you accept their idea about nationalism being necessarily front and center to communism, you can come to other imperialism-compatible conclusions, like that Ukraine's regime isn't actually fascist but merely concerned with 'the nation'. They argue this, by the way."

Shea *again* (for a third time!) gets our position completely wrong. Where is he hearing these things about us? We are normally accused of being paid Russian agents two or three times a week. We have made no such argument as the one Shea attributes to us. We have not defended

Ukraine, nor even come close to it. Not beyond stating (not even as an official line) that, assuming there *is* a real distinction between the Ukranian and the Russian, then the Ukranian deserves to exist without being assimilated – but even in this case, the Ukrainian nation is not what is being captured in the current war effort, which is focused on the *majority-Russian* parts of Ukraine. Where did Shea get these ideas about us? Is he confusing a vivid dream for a real memory?

We openly declare – for a much better reason than Shea does, by the way – that Ukraine's government *is* "fascist". But we do not consider "fascism" to be what Hollywood has taught us. We consider "fascism" to be *the expression of the power of finance capital,* i.e. precisely what is seen in Ukraine, which, like the pretty daughter of a senator, is being mercilessly groped by Biden and the oil barons who pull his strings, all so that its President, a Jewish comedian who says he wishes to convert the country into a "second Israel", can see that the state is integrated into the EU.

That is why Ukraine is "fascist". We do *not,* as Shea does, consider Ukraine to be "fascist" simply because the Azov Battalion hails the swastika, or because their generals make blood omens to Hitler – just as we do not consider one a communist simply because he praises Lenin and waves the Soviet flag while singing the

International. “Fascism” is a matter of *principles and practices*, and one would be quite misguided to condemn any who have the misfortune of falling for the Hollywood depiction of Hitler, which tends to flatter him by reducing his ideology to “Germany shall be great,” removing all the parts about overpopulation and assimilationism and pederasty and Zionism and all of the other worn out bourgeois tripe which would at once make the modern nationalist realize that Hitler was indistinguishable from your average Harvard liberal.

> “The logical conclusion of their ideas is that whites need to form their own state in America for the sake of combating US imperialism, and that white nationalism can’t be fascist because it supposedly stands in utter opposition to the imperialist state (i.e. ZOG rebranded).”

The question to be asked: would Shea not support the destruction of the “imperialist state”, i.e. USA, even if it were done by the white nationalists? Here, he comes as close as he can (though never dares to say it outright) to admitting that *he would support the imperialist state against a nationalist uprising by the proletariat.* Does Shea not realize that he has admitted to this? If he is not a federal agent, then he here admits he is willing to become one. Faced with his own words, there are only two sensible routes for him to take: either he must renounce this view and side with the nationalists

against the imperialist state *unconditionally,* that is to say, under *all circumstances* (including those he finds unfavorable or unlikeable); or he must admit in the open that *he would take up arms for the imperialist state.*

As for the notion that the imperialist state, i.e. the USA, is "ZOG rebranded" (by which I assume he means to say it is run by Jews), we can only observe that Shea does not really delve into this subject, whether he personally believes it or not, and we have a feeling he probably does not want to. But since he brought it up, we dare him to give us a list of the top twenty donors to the Republican and Democratic Parties, and tell us honestly how many of these forty men are Jewish. Better yet: we dare him to simply tell us who the two biggest donors of the Republican and Democratic Parties are, and if they are Jewish. We dare him to go through Biden's cabinet members (the important positions, like Secretary of State, etc.), and tell us how many are Jewish. Indeed, if men like Shea see nothing wrong with Jews, then they should celebrate to see that these people have risen so far since the ghettos of Europe?

We can only expect that Shea will find an excuse as to why accepting our challenge is beneath him, why this would be "fascist" or "anti-semitic", or whatever other thinly veiled diversion he should borrow from the playbook of CNN. But the simple fact is that Shea should not

have pushed an idea if he did not want to see it get pushed back. If he wants to prove he is serious, and is truly arguing on principle and for the sake of truth (rather than to stir up trouble and sow confusion, as it so appears), then we dare him – on our reputation and his – to follow the subject he brought up to its conclusion. If he is too scared to do this, then he should offer us an apology for bringing it up. If he is not willing to do any of these, then we will know he is a mere trouble-stirrer and can be safely ignored as far as politics go.

> "In reality, white nationalism has only two potential roles," writes Shea, "Neither of which are anti-imperialist. One is to serve as a rival imperialist force to the current settler state, seeking to break from the U.S. so that whites can occupy Native lands with less restrictions on their ability to carry out racial terror. The other is to serve as a proxy for the existing settler imperialist state, carrying out terrorism against Blacks, Natives, Brown people, and communists. As in the people who the state seeks to continue repressing."

Let us address the first point: that white nationalism is to serve as a "rival imperialist force". Whether we agree with this assertion, we will not say. We will *presume* it to be true, for the sake of argument. Even in this case, we ask Shea: would he not support a "rival imperialism" insofar as it threatens another imperialist force?

Did Lenin not say that the imperialist world – before any communist state existed – was divided into "two great camps", and that those movements which arise to threaten the established order of imperialism should be supported as far as they can provide new opportunities for the movement of the working masses? Did Lenin not say in his *Letter to American Workers* that "the French monarchist and I shook hands, although we knew that each of us would willingly hang his partner, because for a time our interests coincided"? Did he not make it explicit that "against the Germans, the Russian socialist revolution utilized the counter-interests of other imperialists"? Did he not write that "however much the imperialist sharks fume with rage, I shall not hesitate one second to enter into a similar agreement with the German imperialists if an attack upon Russia by Anglo-French troops calls for it"?

Let us address the second point: that white nationalism is to "serve as a proxy for the existing settler imperialist state, carrying out terrorism against Blacks, Natives, Brown people, and communists." First, we ask: what in the world are "Brown people"? This is the racial brain of an American at work. Shea, who earlier accused us of racism, now resorts to racism. It seems his accusations were projection. We, unlike Shea, do not even provide for a category of "Brown", nor even of "Native", which is really an offhand way for the assimilator to group

100+ nations into a single identity. These are racialist notions, and we are nationalists, not racists. Either way, what Shea describes – white nationalists serving as "a proxy for the existing state" – is clearly not our position, and even he admits this when he laments of how we oppose the imperialist state even if it means supporting white nationalists.

> "The way the mods of the MAC subreddits are trying to create a substantial platform is by roping in communists, then diligently picking arguments with posters from outside their community. They meticulously pick apart people's statements, extrapolating points that aren't intended so they can sow doubt. They don't need to change the minds of the people they're arguing with, just create threads in which they appear to be the smarter and more theoretically informed ones to onlookers. Their 'so you're saying...' arguing tactic reveals how vacuous their points actually are."

This is maybe the weakest paragraph in Shea's article, because it reveals he either has not read much communist theory (whether from Marx, Lenin, Mao, Stalin, etc.), especially on the topic of dialectical materialism, or he is simply trying to stir chaos by whining. What Shea must learn is that words are only reflections of thoughts, and thoughts are only reflections of physical realities. What Shea sees (and does not like) is that Marxists tend to look for the *implications* in what someone is writing, beneath

what they explicitly say out loud. If the reader were approached by a stranger on the subway, who said that he is going visit the reader with a loaded shotgun after dark, he has not really issued an *explicit* threat, but the *implications* are still perfectly enough to make sense of what's going on. A very long time ago, this was called philosophy; but with time, it came to be known as common sense. Unfortunately, it appears to be once more deferring to the realm of philosophy.

> "Under settler-colonialism, whites are the colonizers, and don't require 'self-determination' because they already have disproportionate power as is."

The age old argument. And so, when the "disproportionately powerful" become disproportionately powerless, what will Shea say then? Will he then be scolding the Blacks for calling for self-determination, saying they already have disproportionate power? And we will just keep doing this game back and forth until we perish? By some miraculous feet, Shea has managed to discover the ideology that motivated the skit from *Monty Python's Flying Circus* about "Dennis Moore", who steals so much from the rich to give to the poor that he ends up "stealing from the poor to give to the rich" – only, Shea was not attempting to make us laugh.

> "Communists must unequivocally reject white nationalism, and not enable those

> who seek to normalize it within communist spaces."

But why? Shea's article abruptly ends there. It is difficult to write a polemic without principles, because it inevitably leads to attacking a position without offering any substantial alternative in its place. Shea has attacked ideas, but has not put forth any of his own. A communist should know how to listen, and how to speak. As it goes, a slave knows only how to listen; a chauvinist knows only how to speak.

J. VOLKER